



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,361	05/16/2005	Erwin Weh	JFIE5.004APC	1080
20995	7590	08/01/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			RIPLEY, JAY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3679	

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/506,361	Applicant(s) WEH ET AL.	
	Examiner Jay R. Ripley	Art Unit 3679	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/16/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/06/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application PCT/EP03/02112 filed on 03/02/2002..

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references cited in the Search Report filed on 06/06/2005 have been considered.

Drawings

3. The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81(c). No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). For this office action, the drawings supplied with the correspondence dated 09/02/2004 (Specification - Not in English) were utilized.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 4, line 3, "axial slots 2" should be --axial slots 32--.
5. In claims 2 and 6, line 2 in both, "the" should be inserted before --sliding--.
6. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claim 1, line 2, the “especially” recitation is improper as it is not clear whether or not it sets forth a required limitation of the claim.

9. In regard to claim 3, line 3, it is not clear what as to what constitutes a “low amount of lateral fitting play.”

10. In regard to claim 7, line 3, the phrase “spring-type” renders the claim indefinite because the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired; i.e. it is not clear what constitutes “spring type.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krannak (U.S. 2,070,013). In regard to claim 1, Krannak provides connection

Art Unit: 3679

coupling comprising a sliding sleeve (70) for locking collet chucks (56) via a connection nipples (30), wherein a guide sleeve (28) with longitudinal grooves (54) is arranged between the sliding sleeve and the collet chucks in which the collet chucks are guided (column 2, lines 44-55 and column 3, lines 1-3).

13. In regard to claim 2, Krannak provides a spacer sleeve (72) that is exchangeably fit into sliding sleeve (column 3, lines 7-10).

14. In regard to claim 3, Krannak provides, wherein the collet chucks are inserted into the longitudinal grooves with a low amount of lateral fitting play. Note that a low amount of lateral fitting play is an inherent attribute of utilizing guide sleeves with longitudinal grooves.

15. In regard to claim 5, Krannak provides a radially circular annular groove outside of the guide sleeve (Figure 5).

16. In regard to claim 6, Krannak provides that the annular groove is formed in a shoulder between sliding sleeve and spacer sleeve (Figure 5).

17. In regard to claim 9, Krannak provides that three collet chucks and three longitudinal grooves are provided in a 120-degree division in the guide sleeve (Figure 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3679

19. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krannak as applied to claim 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 above, and in further view of Dailey et al (U.S. 3,240,520). Krannak provides a guide sleeve, but fails to disclose a centering incline at its front end. Dailey et al teach an internal truncated conical surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a centering incline as taught by Dailey et al to the front end of Krannak's guide sleeve to serve as a guide to facilitate the interconnection of the connection coupling components (column 3, lines 72-75, and column 4, lines 1-2).

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krannak as applied to claim 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 above, and further in view of Reiter (U.S. 6,202,383) or Maycock (U.S. 4,339,023). Krannak provides a connection coupling wherein the guide sleeve is exchangeably fastened to a front housing part. Krannak fails to provide for the use of at least one spring-type straight pin to exchangeably fasten the guide sleeve to a front housing part. Reiter teaches the use of a spring-type straight pin as an alternative to threaded fasteners to axially fix nested tubular components in relation to one another

Art Unit: 3679

(column 8, lines 3-9). Maycock teaches the use of a spring-type straight pin to limit axial separation of components (column 1, lines 28-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the threaded connection as used by Krannak with a spring-type straight pin as they are art recognized equivalents (Reiter) or to allow for maintaining spatially relation between components as wear occurs (Maycock).

22. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krannak as applied to claim 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 above, and further in view of Brown (U.S. 5,647,910). Krannak provides a connection coupling comprising a sliding sleeve for locking collet chucks via a connection nipples, wherein a guide sleeve with longitudinal grooves is arranged between the sliding sleeve and the collet chucks in which the collet chucks are guided with a sealing piston (36, figures 2 and 5) held radially within the collet chucks. Krannak fails to provide for a scraper ring being held radially within the collet chucks around the sealing piston. Brown teaches a scraper ring (160) being positioned radially about a reciprocating member (column 8, lines 34-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Krannak's connection coupling with a scraper ring as taught by Brown around the sealing piston to scrape off any foreign matter adhering to the sealing piston as the device is operated (column 8, lines 37 and 38).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay R. Ripley whose telephone number is 571-272-7535. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00AM - 3:00PM.

Art Unit: 3679

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


J. R. Ripley
24 JUL 2006



DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600